

**NEVADA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**November 17, 2010**

A meeting of the Nevada County Transportation Commission (NCTC) was held on Wednesday, November 17, 2010 in the Truckee Town Council Chambers, 10183 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, California. The meeting was scheduled for 9:30 a.m.

Members Present: Ann Guerra, Sally Harris, Larry Jostes, Chauncey Poston, and Ed Scofield

Members Absent: Nate Beason and Carolyn Wallace Dee

Staff Present: Daniel Landon, Executive Director; Nancy Holman, Administrative Services Officer; Toni Perry, Administrative Assistant

Standing Orders: Vice Chairman Jostes convened the Nevada County Transportation Commission meeting at 9:42 a.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC COMMENT

Vice Chairman Jostes asked for public comments to be held until the end of the meeting.

CONSENT ITEMS

1. Financial Reports:
  - A. August 2010 and September 2010. *Approved.*
  - B. Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee Program Fund Annual Report for FY 2009/10. *Approved.*
  - C. FY 2010/11 Regional Surface Transportation Program Balances. *Approved.*
2. NCTC Minutes:

September 8, 2010 Meeting. *Approved.*
3. Revised Findings of Apportionment for FY 2010/11. *Adopted Resolution 10-42 approving the Revised Findings of Apportionment for FY 2010/11.*
4. Allocation Request from Nevada County. *Adopted Resolution 10-43 approving the County of Nevada's request for a revised allocation of \$582,844 from Local Transportation Funds; an allocation of \$465,667 from State Transit Assistance Funds; and an allocation of \$103,082 from Community Transit Services Funds for transit/paratransit operations for FY 2010/11.*

5. Allocation Request from the City of Grass Valley. *Adopted Resolution 10-44 approving the City of Grass Valley's request for an allocation of \$116,775 of Local Transportation Funds for transit/paratransit operations for FY 2010/11.*
6. Allocation Request from the City of Nevada City. *Adopted Resolution 10-45 approving Nevada City's request for an allocation of \$27,770 of Local Transportation Funds for transit/paratransit operations for FY 2010/11.*

Commissioner Harris made a motion to approve Consent Calendar Items #1-6. Commissioner Guerra seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

#### ITEM PULLED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

7. NCTC Proposed Meeting Schedule for 2011.

Commissioner Guerra pulled the proposed meeting schedule for 2011, based on the discussion that took place at the Transit Services Commission meeting prior to the NCTC meeting. Commissioner Scofield explained that on January 19, 2011 the Nevada County Board of Supervisors have a board retreat scheduled, which would keep him, Commissioner Beason, and Alternate Commissioner Owens from being available to attend the NCTC meeting scheduled for that date. It was proposed that the January meeting date be moved to January 26, 2011.

Commissioner Scofield made a motion to change the date of the next NCTC meeting from January 19<sup>th</sup> to January 26, 2011. Commissioner Guerra seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

#### INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

8. Correspondence

D. NCTC staff letter to the City of Grass Valley - Comments on the *Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Loma Rica Ranch Specific Plan Project*. 11/2/10, File 1111.3.

Commissioner Poston said he would like to thank NCTC staff for the comments they submitted on the Loma Rica Ranch Project Draft EIR. He noted that it was apparent that staff spent a lot of time reviewing the report and he felt it was important to take this in-depth interest in the project. Executive Director Landon stated that the consultant team that is doing the Draft EIR has been in contact with NCTC staff regarding the comments submitted and the consultants are working to address the comments.

Vice Chairman Jostes asked if there was a deadline for comments and a completion date. Executive Director Landon said the comments on the Draft EIR were due by November 15<sup>th</sup>. He said the consultant now has an opportunity to respond to the comments and all the responses will be included in the Final EIR.

9. Executive Director's Report

9.1 Dorsey Drive Interchange

Executive Director Landon reported that Caltrans worked up a phasing concept for the Dorsey Drive Interchange in an attempt to bring the cost of the first phase in line with the \$10.5 million expected from the state. He said they were able to bring the project down to about \$11.4 million for the construction component, and there would still be another \$3 to \$3.5 million needed for construction management. A phone conference was held with Caltrans staff and local staff and options are being discussed to bring the project cost down further. Mr. Landon said this is a work in progress where they are refining the project to determine the lowest amount needed to build the project that meets the need and purpose of the project. He said the project would then go before a subcommittee of the NCTC to be sure nothing has been overlooked that would create a problem for decision makers. After that review, the project would be brought forward to the community.

Commissioner Poston reminded the Commission of a previous decision to not build a partial interchange, but this approach would keep the needed components in the project and phase in work, like soundwalls, at a future date when additional funds become available. He was delighted and hoped this approach works.

#### 9.2 TIGER II Funding

Executive Director Landon stated that there were many more applications received for the money than is available. There were four projects selected in the State of California and the Dorsey Drive Interchange funding was not one of them.

#### 9.3 Tinloy Street Transit Transfer Facility

Executive Director Landon reported that the bids for the transfer facility exceeded the engineers estimate and therefore the bids were rejected. Bid documents will be revised and the project will be rebid. The project is still moving forward and completion is expected by August 2011.

#### 9.4 Town of Truckee Transit Service Contract

Executive Director Landon stated that the Town of Truckee has approved a new transit service contract with their current operator. Mr. Landon spoke with Alex Terrazas, Assistant to the Town Manager, that morning and he said the new contract is almost in place.

#### 9.5 Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Commission (TTALUC)

Executive Director Landon said the first meeting of the TTALUC was held on October 19<sup>th</sup>. The seventh member was selected and operational items such as the bylaws and acceptance of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan were accomplished. There will be a second meeting in January.

#### 9.6 North State Super Region

Executive Director Landon said the North State Super Region meeting was held in Chico on October 20<sup>th</sup>. He thought it was a very productive meeting and the members learned about potential federal legislation that may bring some funding to Nevada County. The information has been provided to Doug Farrell at the Nevada County Department of Public Works. The organization is monitoring what is being done to hopefully restore some funding to counties that used to be involved in timber harvest receipts. The next Super Region meeting is tentatively scheduled for February 16, 2011.

10. Caltrans District 3 Project Status Report: Winder Bajwa, Caltrans Project Manager for Nevada County.

- *Dorsey Drive Interchange* – Mr. Bajwa said that based on the discussion with Tim Kiser, Steve Castleberry, and Executive Director Landon, Caltrans is looking at other elements to cut the costs to build phase one of the project. The soundwalls, shortening of the Dorsey approaches, and also landscaping was moved into phase two of the project to bring the initial construction cost estimate to \$11.2 million. They will continue to examine reduction of costs even more to bring them in line with the \$10.5 million programmed. Mr. Bajwa said that Caltrans will need to redo some of the traffic analysis if plans for the bridge or auxiliary lanes are changed to assure the changes will not impact the mainline traffic on SR 20/49 or cause safety or operational issues.

Commissioner Scofield commented that if Caltrans went out to bid on the Dorsey Drive Interchange project right now, he thinks the responses would come in under the engineers' estimates, based upon the larger construction projects the county has had. He feels if they wait for two or three years the current estimate will be too low and he is frustrated. Mr. Bajwa said he shares his frustration and he thinks this would be the time to take any project out to bid. He added that current estimates are based on recent bid responses and that was how the Dorsey Drive project was brought down from \$23 million estimated three years ago to \$18 million one and one-half years ago, and now it is down to \$14 million. He said Caltrans is trying everything they know to get the cost down and they would very much like to have the Dorsey Drive Interchange out to bid as soon as possible.

- *SR 49 Five Lane Widening at the La Barr Meadows Road Intersection* – Mr. Bajwa reported that most of the utility work is done and there are a couple of poles that still need to be moved. This work will be completed in the next month. Construction work was suspended for the winter and is scheduled to begin in April or May of 2011.
- *SR 89 Pedestrian Undercrossing and Mousehole Interim Improvements Project* – The Draft Environmental Document and the Draft Project Report are being finalized and are slated for completion in December. Caltrans staffing issues delayed the work. The reports will be circulated to the public, NCTC staff, and Town of Truckee staff.
- *SR 20 Safety Project between Penn Valley Road and Deadman's Flat Overcrossing* – Mr. Bajwa said the design work is in progress and construction is scheduled for the summer of 2011.
- *SR 49 Minor A Operational Project* – There are four locations planned for minor operational improvements. Funding is anticipated in FY 2012/13, but Caltrans will try to accelerate the project funding if at all possible by putting the projects on a contingency list.

Executive Director Landon reported that he met with representatives from the Golden Oaks Homeowners Association and they were appreciative to see the graphics and understand the plans. They are interested in the Brewer Road connection, which is the main entrance into their subdivision. They provided comments and another stakeholders meeting is planned to formally convey those comments to Caltrans Traffic Operations staff and get some feedback to the Homeowners Association representatives. Mr. Landon spoke to Debby Porter, Homeowners Association President, and they are planning a January meeting.

Vice Chairman Jostes asked what level of engineering is done on these projects when potential funding is not available until 2012/13. Is it just a conceptual layout or is it taken to the ready-to-bid stage? Mr. Bajwa replied that these are Minor A Program projects that are under \$1 million in construction costs. Caltrans will get the projects ready for construction within two years versus a major project that takes four or five years to take to construction. He said the preliminary work has started such as environmental studies and documentation, right-of-way acquisition if needed, but they hope to stay within Caltrans' existing right-of-way.

- *Restripe Intersection at Uren* – Mr. Bajwa reported that this project was completed. Caltrans modified the intersection and did some restriping.

Commissioner Scofield congratulated Caltrans on the extended passing lane from Combie/Wolf Road north. He drives it frequently and said it is working out well.

Mr. Bajwa reported to the Commission that Caltrans resources budget and support costs have been cut for engineering statewide, and they are trying to maintain their staffing as much as possible without hiring. He said Caltrans is being impacted by the problems with the California State Budget and the Governor has called a special session to address the \$6 billion deficit.

Commissioner Harris commented that as the Commission goes through the process of creating the Pedestrian Improvement Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan she would like to see the NCTC get focused on the numerous projects and what realistically can be done with the funding available. She stated that the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, which are federal funds, appear solid, but the process requirements make it a challenge to meet the deadlines each year. She would like to stay focused and not lose money in hand.

#### ACTION ITEMS:

11. Draft Nevada County Pedestrian Improvement Plan: Presentation by Meghan F. Mitman, AICP, Senior Transportation Engineer/Planner from Fehr and Peers Transportation Consultants. (Copies of the draft report were provided to the Commissioners only.)

Executive Director Landon introduced Meghan Mitman and Charlie Alexander of Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants and commented how pleased everyone has been with their extensive efforts to reach out to the community for input. Mr. Landon referred to Commissioner Harris' comment about being focused and he noted that a priority with this plan is to put the best projects forward for the money that is available and also have projects on the shelf should additional money become available, as what happened with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) projects.

Meghan Mitman stated she is the Project Manager for the creation of the Nevada County Pedestrian Improvement Plan, and Charlie Alexander has done a lot of the writing and field work for the project, as well as much of the preparation for the public outreach they did. She said the funding for the plan was provided through a Caltrans Community-Based Transportation Planning Grant in the amount of \$65,000 to NCTC. She noted that the goal was to focus on increasing walking in Nevada County as a form of transportation. This is not a recreational trails plan. The purposes of the study were to objectively evaluate pedestrian needs, identify and prioritize improvement projects, improve access to funding by having the prioritized list, and to supplement the adopted plans that are already

in effect currently through the county jurisdictions. Ms. Mitman said they would like to focus on walkability, pedestrian orientation, climate change, and multimodal transportation. She explained that a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) was organized with members from NCTC, Caltrans, Nevada County, City of Grass Valley, City of Nevada City, the Town of Truckee, and Live Healthy Nevada County representatives. They met periodically throughout the plan development to get feedback and present draft components to the group. The consultant did a series of public participation efforts to make sure they understood what the starting point was, what were existing needs, where the support for opportunities was, and what the trade-offs were that the public would really like them to examine in terms of picking priority projects. They conducted public workshops with maps and aerial views of the county and listened to what the public had to say. Transportation Planner Mike Woodman attended local public markets to reach out to individuals who were not able to attend the workshops. There was also an online survey on the NCTC website that people could participate in. In September they did walking audits in locations that had been narrowed down to be likely focus areas, often where pedestrian safety was a concern, or where people should be walking but are not currently. Community members and PAC members went on the walking audits to identify more specific sites as they moved from existing conditions and documentation into the recommendation phase of the project.

Charlie Alexander explained what the draft plan includes and why the elements will be helpful to the Nevada County jurisdictions. The first chapter addresses existing conditions where they looked at the U.S. census data to identify what the existing baseline level of walking for transportation was in the county in the year 2000. They looked at how encouragement of walking might change things and improve the number of people that were walking. He said the biggest effort of the plan was to inventory existing pedestrian infrastructure; therefore they worked with jurisdictions to develop a roadway network of arterial and collector streets, and in some cases a few local streets where the jurisdiction wanted the consultant to inventory sidewalks, curb ramps, and crosswalks. Mr. Alexander said they did a GIS-linked video inventory and then converted all of that information back into the GIS layers, which were shown in the maps provided in the draft plan. They drove a vehicle with a mounted camera in it over one hundred miles of roadways. He believes this is groundbreaking for the jurisdictions, since prior to the plan they did not have an inventory of where all of their sidewalks were. The information is useful when projects are developed to determine if sidewalks are in the proximity of the project or if sidewalks need to be incorporated into the project.

Mr. Alexander said they took the past five years of California Highway Patrol collision data and mapped it for each jurisdiction, so they were able to identify hot spot pedestrian-vehicle collision areas to focus on. These maps would help shape their recommendations for the different types of projects that should be implemented. The consultants noticed that the primary collision type for many of the incidents was pedestrians walking in the street, so their recommendations were heavily focused through the PAC involvement toward reducing those collisions.

Mr. Alexander reported that several of the jurisdictions have very good existing plans that are supportive of pedestrian transportation, so they brought all of those existing policies together in hopes that the Pedestrian Improvement Plan will supplement all the existing adopted plans. The PAC said they want to encourage and improve conditions for pedestrians in Nevada County, but at the same time the county is largely rural and historic, and that character is something that is desired to be maintained. The goals and policies in the Pedestrian Improvement Plan were developed to reflect that.

Using all of the public outreach feedback and the existing conditions, Fehr & Peers developed the proposed pedestrian projects. The plan includes the recommended sidewalk network, which is the second set of maps, and Mr. Alexander believes it is the second most critical piece next to the existing conditions assessment. For all the jurisdictions, it is the first time they questioned where they would realistically want sidewalks to go in the future. Mr. Alexander said to ask that question overcomes a roadblock because the jurisdictions know now where they want future sidewalks; the task is now to implement them one-by-one. He stated the projects were prioritized based on different factors, such as safety, access to key destinations, and access for the disabled. The projects were organized in three tiers of high, medium, and low priority, instead of doing a numerical list of projects. He believes that this provides flexibility for the jurisdictions, so all Tier 1 projects are equal and they do not have to justify their ranked number over another. One of the purposes of the plan is, once the infrastructure is in place, to encourage and get people out to use the facilities.

Mr. Alexander said the chapter on implementation includes information on funding sources and the best way for Nevada County jurisdictions to position themselves to acquire funding from those sources, including how to be competitive for grants, and key things to include in applications. There are also the top seven projects identified by the jurisdictions with fact sheets and cost estimates that will help NCTC and the jurisdictions when they want to move forward with these projects and apply for the grants. It answers questions as to why the project is needed, who it serves, what safety benefit does the project offer, and how much it will cost. Mr. Alexander said initially they were asked to create ten fact sheets, but the jurisdictions came back and said they would really like to have maps that show a proposed network of pedestrian infrastructure, so that was a tweak mid-project that the jurisdictions thought would be helpful.

The consultants asked the jurisdictions what they had the most difficulty properly designing when it came to designing pedestrian infrastructure. They included design guidance sections on how to pressure fit and how to build new infrastructure, when it does happen, that is as friendly as possible for pedestrians.

Mr. Alexander opened up the discussion for questions from the Commission. Commissioner Guerra congratulated the team on all the efforts put forth to engage the public and she is confident that all the right people were contacted in a variety of ways. She was impressed with the magnitude and results of their work and feels the plan is what the community needs to help make things happen. Commissioner Guerra said she has been aware for a long time, with her work around accessibility, how some sidewalks that were built by a new development end abruptly in a patch of weeds. She mentioned the bus stop on Zion Street, near the NCTC office, and how it creates a risk as you get off the bus and that there is no sidewalk to travel on. She thought the consultants did an incredible job and said the plan is a wonderful resource of information for Nevada County.

Commissioner Harris noted there was a section in the plan on funding sources and she assumes part of the effort to produce the plan is that it is a stepping stone to get funding. She questioned what new opportunities are available that the county has not been pursuing to help implement some of the planned projects. Meghan Mitman said there are opportunities the county has been pursuing that the consultant believes the plan will position them better for since a strategic plan prioritized list shows that more thought and planning have taken place as to why a specific project that is applied for in a grant means so much to the community. She said there are also numerous opportunities for Safe Routes to School funding, and the PAC thought these projects were an important prioritization criteria for the consultant. Ms. Mitman said there are state and federal level funding available for Safe Routes to School, so quite a few of the priority projects are focused on that particular funding

source. Commissioner Harris questioned if there was more money available than what has already been applied for over the years. Executive Director Landon replied that there was not more money available, but with the current budget situation, funding for these projects will become more competitive and by having a plan in place and showing there is a concerted comprehensive effort going on, NCTC hopes to enhance the county's ability to garner those funds when applied for.

Commissioner Harris commented that the Commission should be more strategic when thinking about CMAQ funds and the current three year plan since CMAQ funding is not competitive, but simply money allocated to the county. The CMAQ projects could be ones that may not be as competitive to receive funding. She does not believe the Commission has been strategic in the past, in a formalized way, when determining which projects to put forth competitively for Safe Routes to School. A project for the community that does not fit the criteria could be CMAQ funded. She would like to take it up a level as to how to distribute funds.

Commissioner Harris asked about a Tier 1 project listed for her jurisdiction of Nevada City, which was a sidewalk project located on Searls Avenue between Sacramento Street and Valley Street. She said the project is estimated at \$900,000 and she thought that amount was eye popping for the small community of Nevada City to be able to afford. She agreed that it is an important segment for walkability in Nevada City, but at that price she was not sure when it would ever be a priority to fund. She noticed there was a retaining wall and very sophisticated elements, and she noted that Nevada City usually does things the old fashion way. Commissioner Harris asked the consultants if it was necessary to do that extensive a level of project in order to get the funding and asked if there was any flexibility in the scope of the project. Charlie Alexander clarified that the segment under discussion is an area where they assumed the city would not desire to narrow the street further when constructing a new sidewalk. He said that brings up the question of how to balance priorities and whether to narrow the driving lanes down to nine or ten feet at the sidewalk, or to build a retaining wall. He thought there was a give and take and he would not say that the improvements as recommended were the only way to implement it, but that was one way of doing it. Commissioner Harris said with the plan being in draft form, she wondered if the plan should indicate that project as a Tier 1, given as the report reads currently, it is sort of a stopper. She stated that Nevada City has a sales tax measure that has pedestrian funding in it, but that whole measure over sixteen years is proposed to generate \$7.2 million, so the city cannot spend \$900,000 on one segment of sidewalk. Mr. Alexander said the reason all aspects of the project were incorporated was because the project is a good candidate as a Safe Routes to School project, so that amount is not outside of the realm of what is possible for a Safe Routes to School infrastructure grant. That was why they included all the aspects into one project in hopes that Nevada City could take the project forward and get a large lump sum to do the improvements.

Commissioner Harris noted that there are projects listed in the plan that are completed or already have a funding source identified. CMAQ funding is set for summer 2011 for the East Broad Street section between Main Street and SR 49 that hooks up with the county path. Executive Director Landon said that particular project is one that, while it has been pushed forward and it does have CMAQ funding, the plan brings it into the total infrastructure to see how it fits in with other projects. He believes it would be good to leave the project listed in the plan, even though funding has been identified for it, because it shows how the plan flows out and becomes a comprehensive unit. Commissioner Harris stated that the East Broad Street project, as well as a sidewalk on Searls Avenue between Argall Way and Ridge Road, are listed in Tier 3, but both projects are scheduled for construction in 2011. She questioned if they belong in Tier 3 and if leaving the projects there would degrade from the overall quality of the report that is not quite in sync with the plans in progress.



Meghan Mitman said the draft plan is flexible to shuffle projects into different tiers. Twenty percent of the criteria used in preparing the plan was determining how fundable each project was, but because a project was funded did not necessarily move it to the top. She said they could weight the projects that already have funding secured and consider them Tier 1 projects.

Commissioner Harris questioned if the draft plan was going to be presented at each of the jurisdiction councils and board. Executive Director Landon replied that he and Mr. Woodman could bring the Draft Nevada County Pedestrian Improvement Plan to the councils for their comments. Commissioner Harris thought the plan to be significant enough and it would be important to have everyone on the same page. She said the Nevada City Council would be making decisions in the next two months about Measure S funding, and some of that will be pedestrian funding, so the plan would be helpful for the council to review. Mr. Landon said he would contact the councils and board to get on their agendas.

Commissioner Harris commented to her fellow Commissioners that this is the sort of thing that she thinks over the next six months the Commission would want to be sophisticated and realistic about the various funding sources available to the NCTC, and how to allocate the funds during these challenging times. She thinks it is a crossover between the pedestrian plan, the RTP, and the Bicycle Master Plan a few years ago. She said the Commission has come up with some positive recommendations that are based in realistic assumptions rather than the public thinking there are all these big plans and yet you cannot construct any of them.

Vice Chairman Jostes asked about the process that follows the completion of the pedestrian plan. He questioned if it would be a consolidated process through the NCTC or, for example, there are little pieces of sidewalks that are spread out through the plan, and can an individual jurisdiction look at the plan and say they want to build a project if they have the funding. In other words, can each jurisdiction do what they want with the plan, to a certain extent, if they have resources, or is it going to be a coordinated effort through NCTC. Executive Director Landon replied that the coordination occurred in bringing the plan together and identifying a network for the community. The implementation of the plan is totally flexible, and like the Bicycle Master Plan, NCTC would hope the pedestrian plan would be a tool for each Public Works Department staff to take and plan each year to focus on certain areas and projects in their community. Vice Chairman Jostes asked if the jurisdictions could potentially compete for the same funding. Mr. Landon replied that it would depend on the funding source.

Commissioner Poston asked the consultants if they were involved in proposing Class I bike paths or were they already in place before they did their work. Charlie Alexander responded that they show bike paths on the maps in Grass Valley and Truckee as proposed. Commissioner Poston asked if they had already been proposed by the cities or did Fehr & Peers propose them. Mr. Alexander said they had been proposed by the cities. He stated that in some cases the jurisdiction wanted the Class I bike paths shown on the maps if they were to replace sidewalks. The south side of Idaho-Maryland was identified by the City of Grass Valley as ultimately having no sidewalk on the south side, but showed a Class I bike path shared by bicycles and pedestrians instead of a sidewalk.

Commissioner Poston said he knew the City of Grass Valley took advantage of the Safe Routes to School grant funding to construct improvements that were on the docket for the Grass Valley Traffic Safety Review Committee for years. He said the Traffic Safety Review Committee is beginning to discuss traffic calming features they would like to see in the entries of the Grass Valley downtown corridor. He said the level of service traffic-wise cannot be met in the downtown core; it will always

be at failure because it has constricted streets. The Safety Committee is looking at ways to institute traffic calming to really slow down the flow of traffic, and he feels the pedestrian element is really important. Ms. Mitman asked if Commissioner Poston was familiar with multimodal level of service. She thought that might be something the City of Grass Valley could think about in the downtown area.

Commissioner Poston said the consultants included sidewalks in neighborhoods and questioned if they identified sidewalks that are crumbling and need replacing, or just places where they would like to see linkage with additional sidewalks. Ms. Mitman said they looked at new sidewalks and the capital improvement project level of the plan versus maintenance of existing sidewalks. The inventory includes the width of each sidewalk, and if a curb ramp is present, whether it has a truncated dome, but they did not get down to the level of sidewalk cracking. Commissioner Poston stated that a year ago the City of Grass Valley decided that they would make maintenance of sidewalks the responsibility of the land owners or whoever fronts the sidewalk. To gain passage of that plan the city decided to have a program in place for financial cost sharing because crumbling sidewalks could cost a fortune to replace, as some are elevated four feet off the ground and have railings that have been damaged over the years. Commissioner Poston would have liked to have seen the damaged sidewalks included in the study maps since there are many sidewalks that have been compromised to the point of being dangerous. The city could use the information as a template. He wondered if the information could be added at a later date, from a GIS standpoint, to the Pedestrian Improvement Plan. Mr. Alexander responded that once the plan becomes final, they will be handing off all the GIS and video data to the cities and county to allow them to improve the plan for their own individual uses. Ms. Mitman said the additional inventory could be done in the context of developing an ADA transition plan. It would help the jurisdictions to have an inventory of where the facilities may be deficient and then prioritize and enhance them. Commissioner Poston said he thought the consultants did a great job.

Commissioner Scofield asked Commissioner Poston if the City of Grass Valley could possibly contract with Fehr & Peers to have a more detailed plan for the city done. Commissioner Poston asked the consultants if they would be a part of the presentation to the city councils. Ms. Mitman replied that she and Mr. Alexander would be at the January NCTC meeting with the consolidated comments in the final pedestrian plan, but that is their final presentation. Commissioner Poston said he would no longer be on the Commission as of December and he asked the consultants to remember this conversation and recap it at their final presentation.

Commissioner Scofield thought the plan preparation was done well and he said that some of the comments that Commissioner Harris had were the same as his. When looking at the tier effect of rating projects, he said if Higgins Village at SR 49 and Combie Road were to start construction now, the sidewalk there would become a priority. Also, when work starts on the signalization of Combie Road, that sidewalk is factored into those projects. Commissioner Scofield felt the circumstances are what makes the projects a priority versus the tier rating. He said the Brighton Street project near the fairgrounds will not occur, most likely, until the City of Grass Valley actually makes the annexation of that area, and perhaps if a commercial developer is out there. He referred to the pedestrian/vehicle collisions in Nevada County, as seen in Figure 2A, and said the consultants showed SR 20 when it should be SR 49.

Commissioner Guerra referred to the south side of Idaho-Maryland Road where the pedestrians will share a Class I bike path, and said she does not know what a Class I bike path is. She questioned if it is separated by a structure from traffic. Mr. Alexander responded that a Class I bike path is a

completely separate right-of-way that is usually ten to twelve feet wide and landscape separates it. He did not know what that specific bike path was designed to be. Commissioner Poston reviewed that the consultants were not involved in bike path planning so he did not go into the details of whether they considered a smaller path. Commissioner Guerra was glad the bike path was combined with the pedestrian path since she was concerned with the pedestrian/vehicle collision issues and she would not want people walking along the street.

Vice Chairman Jostes reviewed that there had been a suggestion to present the pedestrian plan to the city councils and the county board. He asked if this would be the forward process before the plan is finalized. Executive Director Landon replied affirmatively that NCTC staff will make arrangements to go before the councils and get their comments. He added that Mike Woodman is the project manager and is the most familiar staff member with the plan so he will give the presentations. Vice Chairman Jostes asked what a realistic expectation would be for the final plan, given the holiday schedule. Mr. Landon said the initial plan was to bring the final plan back to the Commission in January, but with the potential four additional presentations to be done first, he is thinking that may bump it to the March meeting to be sure everything is done. Commissioner Harris said the Commission will have a new Grass Valley Commissioner in January, plus the two Commissioners that were absent at the current meeting who did not hear the presentation on the pedestrian plan. Vice Chairman Jostes said due to obvious funding issues, the pedestrian projects are not going to rush forward, so a little more time to get all the feedback seemed like the right thing to do.

Commissioner Poston said if the City of Grass Valley took the opportunity to inventory sidewalk conditions, and they wanted to include the inventory in the current pedestrian plan from a GIS perspective, could it be easily accomplished before the plan is finalized. Mr. Alexander said they would have to talk to the staff performing the inventory and understand how it is being done, and see if it would be possible. Commissioner Poston said it would be great if the additional information could be included into this master document. Ms. Mitman said if they were given a map to include into the plan in the existing conditions chapter that would be fine. She said it is a question whether it would get plugged into the project pipeline and prioritization analysis. Commissioner Poston requested someone contact Tim Kiser, Grass Valley Public Works Director, to determine how far along the inventory is.

Vice Chairman Jostes agreed with the other Commissioners that it is a well documented and well laid out report and he thinks it will be quite useful. Meshing the wish list with the reality of the economy and having it reflected in the report so it is a realistic guideline would be useful. He thanked the consultants for their presentation.

12. NCTC Draft Regional Transportation Plan Update (Copies of the draft report were provided to the Commissioners only.)

Executive Director Landon reported that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is updated every five years as mandated by state law. He said it includes identification of policies related to Nevada County; an action element that provides a discussion of each component of the regional system, including streets, roads, aviation, transit, and a financial element. He stated that as there has been a diminishing of state and federal funding for transportation, by statutory guidance the plan is supposed to be "fiscally constrained"; meaning there is a list of projects that there is reasonable expectation will be funded, and given the moving target of our budgetary deficits, it is really hard to make an assumption at this point. They have done the best they could and accept that adjustments may have to be made as time goes on with the financial element. The plan becomes a basis for state

and federal funding. If projects are included in a regional plan, they have a leg up for those funding sources. He said the Draft RTP kicks off the public comment period, which is scheduled to conclude on December 29<sup>th</sup>. The RTP is posted on the NCTC website and it has been sent out to individuals who indicated interest. Public outreach will occur to get comments back on the draft. NCTC staff is also working on updating the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which goes with the RTP, within the next few months. The RTP and EIR will go out together in the future for review and comment, but staff wanted to get the RTP out into the community to begin getting comments and to refine it so when the EIR is done the two are packaged together.

Executive Director Landon explained that there is a program level EIR that looks at the broad impacts of the whole process. Major impacts that come from projects will be addressed at the project level when the project is implemented. The RTP EIR looks at the program, as a whole, and how it is achieving the environmental goals for transportation in the community.

Commissioner Harris directed attention to the Funding Forecast located on page 96, Table 19, and said looking at the RTMF Program, at \$1.5 million from 2010 to 2020, it is so small compared to where we were at five years ago and what was expected. And then 2020 to 2030 the revenue is expected to be \$9.022 million. She was curious as to how those assumptions were made. Executive Director Landon replied that staff looked at the history of the RTMF and noted the last two years there has been very little revenue received. The assumption is that this will be a little bit of a protracted downturn and that an increase of revenue will not start in the near future. Staff is then taking a conservative approach that things will grow over time after 2020. Commissioner Harris questioned the RIP (Regional Improvement Program) Funding Forecast on page 96, Table 18, that is the reverse with \$21.6 million from 2010 to 2020 and only \$10 million from 2020 to 2030. Executive Director Landon said the \$21.6 million in the short-term reflects that the county has \$10.5 million programmed currently and that there is a \$5 million unprogrammed balance, so that is \$15 million of the \$21.6 million. Staff then assumes there will be \$1 to \$1.5 million per year in the short-term outside of that, which the previous levels were getting as much as \$4 or \$5 million every two years. Staff is taking a conservative approach with the issues pending around the state budget. Mr. Landon said staff felt pretty good about that estimate until that week when they heard that the \$25 billion hole in the California budget may be going to \$28 billion, so staff will wait and see. Commissioner Harris said the chart assumes the RTMF fees stay the same.

Commissioner Guerra asked if the Draft RTP was an NCTC staff product. Mr. Landon replied affirmatively. Commissioner Guerra said the report was very informative and she thinks it will be very useful with the information included in the demographics. She believes it has application outside of transportation and is a great document.

Commissioner Poston wanted the Commission to know that the City of Grass Valley has been under a lot of pressure from developers to come up with a delayed system of paying RTMF fees instead of paying them all in one lump sum. He thought it may be problematic for projects, depending on how long the time frame is stretched out.

Commissioner Scofield said part of the exchanges on this is the introduction of AB 32, and looking at public transit incorporated into project design makes a lot of sense. He was curious where the county stands with AB 32; does the county anticipate large increases in capital vehicle improvement or is transit already on schedule for that. Executive Director Landon replied that in regard to the county, the vehicle replacements have been ongoing with the CMAQ program and the county is right on time with vehicle replacement. He said currently, with regard to greenhouse gas reduction and

AB 32 and SB 375, rural agencies are not required to do some of the planning level efforts that are required of major metropolitan areas, but the county is seeing the push toward those things. Mr. Landon said the county is trying to identify those impacts now in the RTP, as to where we think that is going, and show the state that Nevada County is doing good planning and that we are taking into account the upcoming policies. The other thing that NCTC staff is going to do as a part of the EIR update is to retain a consultant to review staff's work to ensure that when the plan is sent to the state those issues have been addressed appropriately. Over the past few years Governor-elect Brown, who served as the Attorney General, was coming down fairly heavily on agencies that avoided or ignored those types of issues in their RTP's. Staff has reviewed those plans and the Attorney General's comments, and staff is incorporating what they think are the appropriate measures to cover those things. Then a consultant will take a second look to ensure the county plan will not hit a major wall when the EIR is completed. Commissioner Scofield said that Bill Durant commented in the TSC meeting that Telecare has an aging fleet and he questioned how the new requirements impact an aging fleet. Mr. Landon said NCTC provided CMAQ funding for Telecare to replace some vehicles that the Air Resources Board (ARB) said, based on their requirements, Telecare has to replace. Six months later, as the funding was coming to fruition and NCTC was ready to do it, the ARB came back and said it was their mistake and Telecare did not have to do it after all. Mr. Landon said there has been a continual change as ARB decides what is required and then gets buffeted back and does not require it. He said Proposition 23 failed, in the last ballot, but he continues to believe there will be issues. Mr. Landon mentioned an article where a trucking firm went out, based on ARB requirements, and replaced all of their fleet. Now, because ARB is going to relax the requirement, this trucking firm is no longer competitive. Mr. Landon said it is a changing process and staff is doing their best to stay on top of it.

Commissioner Poston said it is going to be more and more important to do things that get a "bigger bang for the buck", and we may not have the flexibility in the future to use the CMAQ funds to build a sidewalk or bike path, as opposed to doing something else that gets a greater reduction. His staff pointed out to him that replacing a vehicle is probably the most efficient thing to do with CMAQ funds, but it does not bode well for projects the Commission would like to have done on the ground. Commissioner Harris said once you replace a vehicle, it is done, so it is a one time situation. Vice Chairman Jostes said he assumes the responsibility NCTC has to AB 32, in addition to county-owned vehicles, is to put forward plans that address traffic mitigation, as those issues are going to be scrutinized as well. Executive Director Landon replied that land use planning and the transportation interface are things that have been already placed on metropolitan areas. They specifically excluded rural areas or areas that were not considered metropolitan areas. Mr. Landon said that Friday NCTC staff will be at a meeting in Sacramento regarding blueprint planning for rural areas, which is the entrée into that arena for rural areas, so it will be coming. NCTC staff is trying to stay ahead of that curve and work with the local jurisdictions. He said the general plans in place are probably not too bad. One of the issues the metropolitan areas has is they are being told they are perpetuating sprawl and their plans do not take into account the transportation impacts of what their land use plan is. There is not much sprawl in the general plans of Nevada City or Grass Valley; they will not be growing beyond their bounds any time soon. What staff is trying to do in their work with the state is to identify the planning efforts that have been done, and to say, based on transportation modeling, these things are properly planned. Nevada County wants to show the state that rather than they come in and tell us how we have to change our RTP or our general plan, we are trying to be proactive and show them that we have already done that level of planning.

Vice Chairman Jostes asked if the next step after comments is to finalize the RTP. Mr. Landon replied affirmatively.

13. Contract to Develop the Nevada County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Copies of the contract were provided to the Commissioners only.)

Executive Director Landon explained that the Commission is providing the funding to develop the plan because aviation is a part of the county transportation network. The aviation grants that have been available the past few years have dried up due to federal inaction. Faced with potential development in the region of the Nevada County Airport, and a budget that would not allow the airport to update the current 1987 plan, the Commission provided the funding. A consultant was identified through a bid process with a Project Advisory Committee.

Commissioner Scofield asked if NCTC's involvement with the update of the plan was as a result of the recent transfer of responsibility to become the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for the Nevada County Airport. Executive Director Landon replied affirmatively. Commissioner Scofield commented that action cost the Commission \$80,000. Mr. Landon stated for the past several years the Foothill ALUC, when approached by the Nevada County Airport management to update the airport land use plan, said to provide them with \$50,000 and they would put money with it to do the update. The airport did not have the money. Mr. Landon said that NCTC has been frugal with state planning funds, the need for the update was acknowledged, and if the state planning funds are not used they will be lost.

Commissioner Guerra made a motion to adopt Resolution 10-46 authorizing the execution of the contract with Mead & Hunt, Inc. to develop the Nevada County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan in an amount not to exceed \$80,000. Commissioner Scofield seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

14. Status Report: Western Nevada County Transit Development Plan

Executive Director Landon reviewed this is a five year update of the Western Nevada County Transit Development Plan that is an operations or implementation guide for transit services. In September the Transit Services Commission had reviewed the draft plan and asked that it not be moved forward until January to enable the review of the final plan to be done in western Nevada County versus Truckee at the November meeting. Mr. Landon said the requested extension was needed to keep the contract with the consultant active, and without penalty of delay to the contractor, until the work is completed in January 2011. The amount of the contract was not changed, and no additional work was added to the contract.

Commissioner Poston made a motion to extend the contract termination date with Transit Resource Center from September 30, 2010 to January 31, 2011. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Poston made a motion to adjourn the Nevada County Transportation Commission and convene the Nevada County Airport Land Use Commission. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**Adjournment of the Nevada County Transportation Commission by Vice Chairman Jostes at 11:05 a.m. The Nevada County Airport Land Use Commission convened.**

15. PUBLIC HEARING: Restructuring of Fee Schedule by the Nevada County Airport Land Use Commission

Executive Director Landon reported that in May 2010 when the NCTC took on the responsibility as the Nevada County ALUC, they adopted a fee schedule that had been used by the Foothill ALUC, Placer County, and El Dorado County. When the first major project came forward for review, which was the Loma Rica Ranch Specific Plan EIR, Mr. Landon realized that there was a lot of detail in the project that was beyond his expertise to review. He spoke to the consultant that was hired to update the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan about what they thought an appropriate cost would be to review projects such as these. He also reviewed cost structures for other ALUCs around the state. Through those efforts, staff developed a proposed flexible fee schedule that would charge a base fee amount when staff is able to review the project easily and provide the needed input. If the project is complex, then there would be an additional estimated charge. To keep the charge within statutory guidelines, to not exceed the reasonable amount, the charge is based on what a time and materials cost would be with a consultant. Staff recommends the Commission adopt the changed fee schedule so when projects come in, such as the Loma Rica Ranch Specific Plan, the Commission would have the ability to recoup the costs that are put out to use a consultant to do the review and ensure the review is done appropriately.

Commissioner Harris made a motion to adopt Resolution 10-02 of the Nevada County Airport Land Use Commission to restructure the fees charged by the Commission to review projects. Commissioner Scofield seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Guerra made a motion to adjourn the Nevada County Airport Land Use Commission and reconvenes the Nevada County Transportation Commission. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**Adjournment of the Nevada County Airport Land Use Commission by Vice Chairman Jostes at 11:07 a.m. The Nevada County Transportation Commission reconvened.**

NEVADA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Poston announced this was his last meeting on the NCTC. Commissioner Harris thanked him for his work. Commissioner Poston thanked staff and the other Commissioners for the four year experience. Vice Chairman Jostes thanked Commissioner Poston on behalf of the NCTC.

SCHEDULE FOR NEXT MEETING

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Nevada County Transportation Commission is on January 26, 2011 at the City of Grass Valley Council Chambers, 125 East Main Street, Grass Valley, CA.

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Commissioner Guerra moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion.  
Vice Chairman Jostes adjourned the meeting at 11:09 a.m.

Respectfully submitted: Antoinette Perry  
Antoinette Perry, Administrative Assistant

Approved on: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman  
Nevada County Transportation Commission